

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Applicant appreciates the acknowledgement of allowable subject matter in claims 2-3, 8-9 and 14-15. Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 1, 4-7, 10-13 and 16-19.

By the foregoing amendment, the specification and claims 2 and 3 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15 and 20 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

Informal Matters

In the Office Action mailed December 5, 2005, claims 2-3, 8-9 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that "P_j" and "P_j/M" are not defined in claim 2. The Applicant notes that "P_j" is defined in claim 2, as is "P_j/M," indicative of the number of pulses of the output clock signal during a period from the effective transition timing of the first divided signal to the effective transition timing of the j-th divided signal. In addition, "P_j" is described in the specification as filed at, for example, page 10, lines 14-23.

Specifically, page 10, lines 17-19 of the specification describes specific examples of P_j, in which "j" is "2," "3" and "8." In these examples, P_j, for j=2, 3 and 8, respectively, are defined as "P₂ = 128," "P₃ = 256" and "P₈ = 896." It is apparent that "2," "3" and "8" are subscripts in "P₂," "P₃" and "P₈," respectively, and concrete values of "j."

The Applicant notes that if " P_j ," as described in the specification at page 10, lines 17-19, is regarded as " $P*j$ " ($= P \times j$), then, for $j=2$ (i.e., P_2), P would be equal to 64 (i.e., $128/2$), while for $j=3$ (i.e., P_3), P would be equal to 85.33 (i.e., $256/3$), and for $j=8$, (i.e., P_8), P would be equal to 112 (i.e., $896/8$). Thus, " P " cannot be constant if P_j is interpreted as $P*j$, or, equivalently, $(P \times j)$. The Applicant submits that it does not make sense to use " P " for indicating such inconsistent and insignificant values in this context, and that therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the intended meaning of " P_j ."

Notwithstanding the above, the specification and claims 2-3 have been amended to correct the font of the subscript " j ." The specification has been similarly amended to correct the fonts of other subscripts. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed December 5, 2005, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,445,232 to Logue et al. (hereinafter, "Logue"). The Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

Claim 20 is directed to a clock multiplying PLL circuit having a multiple control circuit for performing PLL-control on the oscillator circuit by a predetermined number of times greater than or equal to 2 for each cycle period of the reference clock signal.

In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that Logue discloses this feature in Figs. 3b and 6. However, Fig. 3b of Logue illustrates a timing diagram of the variable clocking circuit shown in Fig. 2a using the digital oscillator of Fig. 3a. Fig. 6 of

Logue illustrates a timing diagram of the variable clocking circuit of Fig. 2a using a delay line fine tuning controller. See, e.g., Logue, col. 3, lines 56-57. Thus, the clock signals illustrated in Figs. 2b and 6 have fractional frequencies of the reference clock frequency multiplied by a multiplier. However, Logue neither discloses nor suggests performing PLL-control on the oscillator circuit by a predetermined number of times greater than or equal to 2 for each cycle period of the reference clock signal, as recited in claim 20.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Logue does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 20. Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 20, nor is claim 20 obvious in view of the Logue. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is allowable over Logue. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The outstanding Office Action indicated that claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to overcome the rejection thereof under 35 USC § 112. In addition, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 15 depend directly or indirectly from allowed claim 1. Thus, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 15 are likewise allowable.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing client matter number 024016-00062.

Respectfully submitted,
Arent Fox, PLLC


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC:elz

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time